



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,008	03/25/2004	Bryan L. Dalton	LM(F)6-495 NP	7833
26294 7590 10/02/2008 TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL & TUMMINO L.L.P. 1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700 CLEVEVLAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, PHILLIP H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2191				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,008

Applicant(s)

DALTON ET AL.

Examiner

Phillip H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2191

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03252004
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 8/11/2008.
2. Claims 1-20 have been canceled; claims 25-38 are newly added; claims 21-38 are pending and have been considered below.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

Applicants assert on pages 11-14 regarding claims 21, 25 and 31 that Huang fails to teach *User Role selection module*.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the allegation as argued. Huang teaches *"In an organizational setting, such as a corporation, an important issue in managing handheld devices is the distribution control of the applications to be installed in the handheld devices. For example, a corporation may develop several different sets of automated work procedures for handheld devices: customer account management procedures for the sales department; machine operation procedures for factories; and inventory control procedures for warehouse. It may be valuable that the sales department devices receive only the account management application, the factory devices receive only the machine operation applications, and the warehouse devices receive only the inventory control applications. It may also be useful that, based on employee roles, devices belonging to different employees receive different sets of*

applications, matched to the employee's respective roles. A manager's device, for example, may get an employee evaluation tool which is not distributed to an employee's device. Furthermore, an organization may provide an additional set of applications, such as utility software, games, and other information databases. At the user's discretion, a subset of these applications may be chosen for download to each handheld device" (see at least col. 1:27-50). Huang clearly states that installing software into a device based on employee's respective roles. The employee's handheld device must maintain a User Role or security or control list or policies module to indicate the employee's respective roles for managing handheld devices in an organization purpose. Therefore, Huang's approach inherently teaches the User Role selection module. Even assuming that Huang's approach does not explicitly teach User Role selection module, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time his invention was made to modify his invention to allow the employee's device to maintain a User Role selection module for the purpose of managing handheld devices in an organization.

Applicants assert on pages 14-15 regarding claims 26 and 35 that Huang fails to teach *"disabling of the application."*

A new ground of rejection is issued.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 211 [R-1] Interpretation of Claims- Broadest Reasonable Interpretation. During patent examination, the pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.

Applicants always have the opportunity to amend the claims during the prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claims, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. See *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 21-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36 and 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103 as being anticipated by Huang et al. (USPN 6,553,375).

As per claims 21, 25 and 34:

Huang teaches

a software application for use with the mobile data acquisition device, the software application being located on a remote computer (see at least *FIG. 4*),

the remote computer transferring the software application from the remote computer to the mobile data acquisition device (see at least *FIG. 7*; also see at least col. 6, lines 25-31 "*...may download to the client device, based on the*

access control list 607 and the management policies, 1. a set of applications selected by the client, 2. a default set of applications that the client device does not have, and..."), the mobile data acquisition device comprising a User Role selection module, an application list module, and an application selection module (It is inherent or obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art. See also the detailed explanation above),

the remote computer installing and activating the software application for use by the mobile data acquisition device (see at least FIG. 7; also see at least col. 6, lines 25-31 "...may download to the client device, based on the access control list 607 and the management policies, 1. a set of applications selected by the client, 2. a default set of applications that the client device does not have, and..."), the software application being determined by a user and replacing a factory default software application (see at least col. 5, line 56 "user selects applications to either delete or to download" – the software applications must be enabled/activated in order for the handheld device to use them).

As per claims 22, 28 and 36:

Huang further teaches

wherein the User Role selection module displays a list of User Roles for the user (It is inherent or obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art. See also the detailed explanation above).

As per claims 23 and 29:

Huang further teaches

wherein the application list module maintains a list of available software applications for the mobile data acquisition device (see at least col. 5, lines 54-55 *"the list applications 506 available for download from the server is displayed...user selects applications to either delete or to download"*).

As per claims 24 and 30:

Huang further teaches

wherein the application selection module maintains a list of enabled software applications for the mobile data acquisition devices (see at least FIG. 3).

As per claim 27:

Huang further teaches

wherein the mobile data acquisition device includes a User Role selection module, an application list module, and an application selection module (see at least FIG. 3).

As per claims 32 and 38:

Huang further teaches

wherein the remote computer maintains an application installation log for determining software applications enabled at a given time (see at least *FIG. 4* - "access control list 407").

As per claim 33:

Huang further teaches

wherein the remote computer requests an application activation file from the mobile data acquisition device (see at least col. 6, lines 9-10 "*the server determines whether the client device has an application list. If the client has an application list, the server retrieves*").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 26, 31, 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (USPN 6,553,375), in view of Poor et al. (USPN 7,123,933).

As per claims 26, 31, 35 and 37:

Huang teaches

wherein the remote computer is configured to disable the first set of applications and enables a second set of applications for the mobile data acquisition device, the second set of applications representing a second User Role.

However, Poor teaches

wherein the remote computer is configured to disable the first set of applications and enables a second set of applications for the mobile data acquisition device, the second set of applications representing a second User Role (see at least col. 3, lines 36-43 "*a remote device can transmit commands to the wireless device to install a program, uninstall a program, initialize a program, enable a program, disable a program,...*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Huang's approach to allow the remote computer to disable the program from the handheld device. One would have been motivated to modify in order to control the applications to be stored in the handheld devices based on the employee's respective roles in an organization.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)

270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PN
9/26/2008
/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191